


### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated September 10, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Constien (U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,932) and Jones (U.S. Pat. No. 6,531,985). With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 12-19 and 21. Based on the arguments and amendments contained herein, Applicants respectfully request allowance.

Claim 1 requires that the display has an external casing “in which a plurality of externally exposed recessed cavities are provided” in which a radio module and an antenna module are received. The Examiner acknowledged that Constien does not disclose such a display, that is, a display having a casing with a plurality of externally exposed recessed cavities into which a radio and an antenna module are received. Instead, for this teaching the Examiner turned to Jones.

The Examiner explained that Jones discloses a “laptop computer [that] is configured with two antennas connected to a wireless PCI card via micro-coaxial cables.” Office Action page 3. Jones, however, specifically discloses, as shown in Fig. 1 below, that the antennas (20a and 20b) are built-in to the base unit 12 of the laptop, not the casing of the display 11, as is required by claim 1.



Further, the wireless card in Jones is also provided in the base unit 12, not the display. Jones does not appear to teach or even suggest that any of the wireless

**Appl. No. 10/034,224**  
**Amdt. dated December 10, 2007**  
**Reply to Office Action of September 10, 2007**

communication hardware is provided in the display 11, much less in an exposed recessed cavity in the display 11. For at least these reasons, Applicants contend that claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are allowable over the cited art.

The same or similar reasons apply to claims 12-23 as well. To the extent there is any confusion as to the location of the "exposed recessed cavities," Applicants amend claim 12 to specify that the display (i.e., not a base unit) has a casing and such casing contains the exposed recessed cavities. Applicants also amend various claims dependent on claim 12 as a result of the aforementioned amendment.

In addition, claim 12 is directed to a display into which radio and antenna modules can be "removably inserted" into externally exposed recessed cavities. The Examiner acknowledged that Constien lacks such a teaching. Applicants respectfully submit that Jones also lacks a teaching that antenna modules can be removably inserted. In fact, the Examiner noted that in Jones the user can "upgrade the wireless radio and underlying software without needing to replace the integrated antennas." Office Action page 5. Since the antennas are integrated as noted by the Examiner and shown in Fig. 1 above, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the antennas of Jones are not removable.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

/Jonathan M. Harris/  
Jonathan M. Harris, Reg. No. 44,144  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS